



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION AT WASHINGTON

IN December last, for the first time since 1895, the American Historical Association assembled at Washington. Six years ago the meeting was not well attended and interest in the Association did not seem to be growing. With intent of awakening new interest and attracting the attention of history students, it was determined to hold some of the meetings in other places than Washington, especially under the auspices and general direction of the universities. The migratory plan seems to have proved successful. Doubtless the new life and energy that are everywhere apparent in the work of the Association are due in large measure to other causes, but they are also in part attributable to the fact that by holding sessions in different parts of the country new members have been added, local interest has been awakened, a large number of persons have been enabled to attend its gatherings, and the Association has been recognized as really national in its purpose and scope.

The growth and increasing influence of the Association were well shown by the large attendance at the Washington meeting, December 27 to 31, 1901. It was estimated that nearly if not quite 200 members were in attendance. Many of them came long distances. Representatives were present not only from the neighboring states, but from California and Texas, as well as from the states of the Mississippi Valley and the farther northeast. There was an unusually large representation from the southern colleges and universities, an indication not only of the value of an occasional meeting in the south, but also of the developing interest in history in the south. One of the most valuable sessions was given to a consideration of topics in southern history, and after the session those that were especially concerned, came together to discuss in an informal conference the general subject of history teaching in

the southern states. The acquaintanceship and mutual co-operation resulting from such a gathering are likely to prove of considerable service in the advancement of historical study.

The local committee, of which General A. W. Greely was chairman and Mr. Gilbert H. Grosvenor was secretary and treasurer, made elaborate preparations to care for the entertainment of the Association. Nothing that could contribute to the comfort and convenience of those in attendance was neglected. Ex-Senator and Mrs. John B. Henderson gave a reception to the members of the Association; Mrs. Roosevelt received informally the lady members and wives of members. The privileges of the Cosmos Club which were generously extended to all were much appreciated. Arrangements were also made to give the amplest opportunity to visit the places and the collections which had special significance for the historical student. The libraries of the State and War Departments were open to inspection under the courteous supervision of Mr. Andrew H. Allen and Mr. J. W. Cheney. Of unusual interest and value were the opportunities of visiting the various departments of the Library of Congress, notably the departments of documents, of prints, of manuscripts and of maps. The hours spent in the library were full of profit and a source of inspiration to the visitors. Many students and teachers will go back to their tasks with renewed hope and courage and with confirmed convictions as to the bright future of historical scholarship in the United States. A great library conducted in the most liberal and enlightened manner, offering its advantages not only willingly but with positive eagerness, will be of incalculable service to historical investigation.

The programme prepared by the committee of which Professor Charles H. Haskins was chairman was of unusual excellence. The topics under consideration were so arranged as to give to each session a character and interest of its own. The American Economic Association likewise held its meeting in Washington and the members of the two Associations were thus enabled to meet together, as they did last year at Ann Arbor and on some previous occasions. Two joint sessions were held; in the first the presidents of the two societies delivered the customary annual addresses; in the other, subjects of common interest to workers in both fields were discussed.

The first session was held Friday evening, December 27, in one of the lecture rooms of Columbian University. The address of Mr. Charles Francis Adams appeared in the January number of the *REVIEW*. It is not necessary therefore to speak of it at length. The reader will remember that Mr. Adams gave it as his conviction that the Asso-

ciation should not forbear entirely from considering topics of political moment. He believed that its members, trained historical investigators and students of past politics, should stand ready to discuss live political subjects in the historical spirit and to offer solutions of present problems in accordance with the teachings of history. It will likewise be remembered that he considered at some length the historical attitude of the United States toward "inferior races" and weaker states. Professor Ely, president of the Economic Association, spoke on Industrial Liberty. He declared that complete liberty cannot be an absolute ideal, because authority is needed in society in order to secure an harmonious co-operation of its various elements, and without social authority we should have no production of wealth and should be without the material basis for that popular liberty which enables men to use their faculties in the common service. The basis of social authority is institutional in the broadest sense, not merely political. Socialism on the other hand does not furnish an ideal industrial condition. The true ideal lies midway between anarchy and socialism; it may be termed the principle of social solidarity. According to this principle, the great institutions must be conserved, but developed in the interests of liberty positively conceived.

The Saturday morning session was held in the assembly room of the Congressional Library. The first paper was read by Miss Lucy M. Salmon, of Vassar College, in advocacy of the establishment of a school of historical studies at Rome. Miss Salmon pointed out that recent years have worked great changes in American universities; that the time has long passed when one could complain, as did John Quincy Adams, that the foot-notes of Gibbon could not be verified in American libraries; that there still exist however certain defects in our educational system, defects due in large measure to our separation from the actual scenes of historical events. The lack of proper correlation of history with other subjects is a noticeable fault in the present situation, and this is especially noteworthy in the absence of proper appreciation of the bearings of classical learning and of archæological erudition on history. It is plain too that the American student needs to have his knowledge vivified by personal acquaintance with monumental records and relics of the past. Above all, the disposition to treat American history as an isolated field of inquiry needs to be counteracted. It is no longer necessary to go to European universities for advanced work, but study in Europe under proper guidance is still to be desired. There is need then of an established colony of American students abroad in some center of historical interest where

their researches can be guided, and where they can receive the sympathetic instruction and counsel that are adapted to their peculiar wants. Miss Salmon argued that the most suitable site for such a school was the Eternal City, replete as it is with interesting suggestions of the past and with stimulating associations for the American scholar.

Professor George L. Burr read an interesting paper on the use of European archives. The article will be published in the *REVIEW* and therefore need not be summarized here. It did not pretend to be in any respect a detailed description of the public records that are accessible to scholars, but only a general characterization accompanied by practical suggestions to American students, that may be contemplating researches in the records of European states. The paper, written with fullness of knowledge and from personal experience, will prove serviceable to those who have not had Professor Burr's opportunities for learning the contents of European archives or the best methods for turning their treasures to account.

Mr. Robert T. Swan, commissioner of public records of Massachusetts, in a valuable paper told an interesting story of the efforts of the commissioners to gather and safeguard the public papers, not only of the state government, but also of the towns and counties of the commonwealth. A general law has been passed requiring the protection of documents. New buildings have been built and old ones remodelled, vaults have been constructed and safes purchased, until now nearly every community has its principal records in safe keeping. Stores of valuable papers have been discovered, examined and placed under proper protection; printing of the records has been encouraged and many volumes have been published; annual reports have been issued containing information for the custodians of records or for those who seek to use them in investigations. Perhaps the most valuable result of the commission's labors is the fact that the importance of keeping papers has been brought to public attention, while the recording officers, finding themselves clothed with more authority and responsibility, have come to appreciate more fully the significance and value of their tasks.

The last paper of the Saturday morning session was given by Mr. Herbert Putnam, the librarian of the Congressional library. He spoke of the character of the library and of the desire cherished by those in charge to make it widely useful and to give every possible facility not simply to readers but to investigators. He referred to his forthcoming report, which would contain matters of detailed information in which the members of the Association would naturally be interested. He spoke also of the desirability of co-op-

eration and mutual understanding between local libraries and the national library, in order that, avoiding injurious competition, each might obtain the material which properly belonged to it. The need of building up the collections of valuable sources was also emphasized, and especially the desirability of obtaining facsimile reproductions or transcripts of American material in foreign archives, an undertaking in which the Historical Association might profitably take active interest. The library is already engaged in the task of preparing card catalogues of the library which are to be deposited in some of the chief cities of the Union and in places where they are likely to be of special service to students; it is also willing to furnish to libraries catalogue cards for such volumes as may be indicated. Publications, like the *List of Maps* recently prepared by Mr. Phillips, are to be issued from time to time, giving students fuller knowledge of the contents of the library. After the morning session, luncheon was served in the restaurant of the library. Captain Alfred T. Mahan and others spoke briefly and informally to those present.

The regular session of the Church History Section was held in the lecture room of Columbian University, Saturday afternoon. Professor Williston Walker spoke most entertainingly of the Sandemanians of the eighteenth century. After outlining the origin of Sandemanianism in the work of John Glas and Robert Sandeman, in Scotland, and describing the theological tenets, worship and discipline of the Sandemanian churches, the speaker described Sandeman's missionary journey to America in 1764, and gave an account of his preaching and appearance at Newport, Danbury, Portsmouth and Boston, presenting information derived from the unpublished manuscripts of President Ezra Stiles, of Yale College. He told of the formation of Sandemanian congregations at Portsmouth, Danbury, Boston, New Haven, Taunton and Halifax, and mentioned some of their leading members. He noticed their prevailing Toryism at the time of the American Revolution—due in part to their confidence in the Biblical command of obedience to kings and all others in authority—and pointed out the consequent difficulties in which they were involved. He narrated Sandeman's American experiences to his death at Danbury, in 1771, and traced the story of American Sandemanian churches through internal disputes and consequent schisms to the extinction of all these bodies save that at Danbury, which he described as still consisting of four members, far advanced in years. The paper presented a curious and little known episode in eighteenth century religious history. The second paper of the session, by President J. E. Rankin, of Howard

University, was a tribute to the life and character of Professor Edwards Amasa Park. Dr. J. L. Ewell, also of Howard University, read excerpts from a sketch of the history of Byfield, a Massachusetts Country Parish.

Of special interest to college men was the conference of teachers in which was discussed the first year of college work in history. The meeting was intended to be very informal in character and to give opportunity for the frank presentation of theories and practices of those who have had somewhat large experience in the conduct of introductory courses. The discussion was led by Dr. Clive Day, of Yale University; Dr. Herman V. Ames, of the University of Pennsylvania; Professor Earle W. Dow, of the University of Michigan; Professor E. D. Adams, of the University of Kansas; Professor K. C. Babcock, of the University of California; and Professor A. C. Coolidge, of Harvard University. It was clear from their reports that the conduct of the work varies considerably. Though the introductory course is usually given in the field of general European history, in some places it is in English history and in others students have a choice from several different courses. Some teachers have in view principally a knowledge of cardinal facts; others, while requiring such knowledge, lay special emphasis on the historical significance of such facts. Frequently very special attention is given to the use of books and the library; sometimes, as at Kansas, maps and historical geography have an exceptionally prominent place. Here and there, as at Pennsylvania, stress is laid upon the life of the people, and lantern slides are extensively used. As a rule the work is carried on wholly in small classes; but in some places, as at Harvard and Michigan, lectures are given to a class of several hundred members. Some teachers require much collateral reading and written work; others rely more on the lecture or on a text-book; in some of the colleges each student is quizzed periodically by an assistant; elsewhere, as at Michigan, the large class is divided into sections for a weekly quiz and discussion. This absence of uniformity in method is no doubt due, not so much to a variety of pedagogical principles, as to varying conditions. But it is clear that though there are numerous differences, there is much agreement. All teachers insist, in one degree or another, upon a knowledge of facts; they all have in view some measure of training in the study of history; each is accustomed to use, not one, but a number of means and methods of securing the end in view; text-book work, collateral reading, oral and written exercises are generally, if not always, required as supplementary to the work of the lecture room. It seems probable that

as history becomes an older and better organized study in the secondary schools, university professors will be enabled to work under somewhat similar conditions, and will more nearly agree in their methods than is now the case.

Only two papers were read on Saturday evening, both of them treating of subjects in American history. Professor Herbert L. Osgood in a carefully prepared paper treated in a general way the most significant features of the relations between Great Britain and her colonies in the seventeenth century. Professor Osgood is interested, not only in the development of the colonies into states or of colonists into American citizens, but in the growth of the British Empire and in the rise and fall of British dominion. The paper was written from the latter point of view. Colonial history has been treated, even by Englishmen, so persistently as if it were only, or in large measure, the history of the United States in its infancy, that one is furnished a pleasing sensation of novelty when he sees many of the well-known facts fitted cleverly into the history of English colonization and used to explain in part the great process of empire building. The main theme of the paper was the gradual development of centralized authority in colonial matters during the first century after Jamestown, the gradual substitution of the royal colony for the colony managed by corporations or by personal proprietaries. Of peculiar interest was the account of the method by which Massachusetts Bay was deprived of its charter. A writ of *quo warranto*, sent out in 1635, was ineffective because to serve the writ on a company whose officers were across the sea and to make return within proper time proved impossible. In 1684, therefore, resort was finally had to a writ of *scire facias*, the personal service of which is not required in order that a court may obtain jurisdiction.

In a paper on James Madison and Religious Liberty, Mr. Gaillard Hunt traced Madison's connection with the establishment of religious liberty in Virginia, showing that in 1776 he had offered in the Virginia Convention an amendment to the Bill of Rights, which, if it had been adopted, would have rendered any subsequent legislation in behalf of religious liberty unnecessary. This amendment was molded by George Mason into that clause of the Bill of Rights relating to religious freedom, but not in the same radical form in which Madison submitted it. Eight years afterwards, Madison returned to service in his state and by means of his memorial and remonstrance, which was sent to every quarter of the state of Virginia and signed as a petition by the voters, he defeated the bill for religious assessment which Patrick Henry had introduced. So

strong an effect did this have in turning the tide which had been setting towards Henry's bill, that the people demanded the enactment of Thomas Jefferson's bill for religious freedom ; and yet this bill, Mr. Hunt contended, would have been redundant if Madison's proposed amendment to the Bill of Rights had been accepted in its original form.

The subjects considered in the Monday morning session were in the field of European history and dealt with the Renaissance and Reformation. Professor E. L. Stevenson of Rutgers College read a paper dealing with the Spirit of German Humanism as it showed itself in the intellectual life of the nation in the period of the Renaissance. He referred to the economic, religious, political and educational preparation for the humanistic movement, and discussed the Italian influence which seems to have been particularly strong in the earlier period. Reference was made to the bearing of humanism on the development of education, literature and the coming of the Reformation. Professor Ephraim Emerton then presented a scholarly piece of critical work in a paper dealing with the Chronology of the Erasmus letters. He examined some of the results already reached upon this question particularly by Richter and Nichols ; illustrated especially the disagreements between editions and the processes by which the recent attempts to establish the dates of the letters have proceeded ; and pointed out that these attempts show cleverness, but are scarcely convincing. He thus came clearly to the conclusion that the problem of Erasmian chronology is still open to investigation.

The third paper of the morning, on Recent Contributions to the History of the Protestant Revolt, by Professor James Harvey Robinson of Columbia, was devoted to a general estimate of the historical literature from which we obtain knowledge of the Reformation. He declared that the material customarily used greatly embarrasses those who are anxious to reach a reasonable judgment as to the issues and the leaders of the movement, and that Janssen, a Catholic historian, gives on the whole the clearest notion of the spiritual life of Germany before the appearance of Luther. He dwelt upon the necessity of studying the church of the Middle Ages with care and impartiality. We hope to present to the readers of the *REVIEW* the full text of Professor Robinson's article as a useful presentation of the most recent work and the best considered opinion concerning the nature of the Reformation.

The second joint session of the Historical and Economic Associations was held Monday evening. Professor A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard presented a paper on Party Legislation in Parliament, in

Congress, and in the State Legislatures. It consisted chiefly in demonstrating a chart of the divisions or yea and nay votes in the House of Commons, Congress and some of the state legislatures, lines of different color indicating the proportion of party votes. For the House of Commons, sessions were taken about ten years apart, beginning in 1836 (when the division lists were first printed); the result showed clearly that party voting was at its minimum about 1860, and that from this time it had increased steadily until, in the last two sessions taken (1894 and 1899), it was very large. For Congress the result showed a very irregular amount of party voting, varying with the question which happened to come up for consideration, there being, for example, a great many votes where party lines were nearly strictly drawn whenever a tariff bill was under consideration, while in some other sessions they were very few. On the average, there is more party voting in Congress than there was in the House of Commons in 1860, but less than there is in the House of Commons to-day. The states taken were Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois, and in all of these, with the exception of New York, the amount of party voting is very slight. Some figures were also given in regard to the proportion of public and private bills enacted by these various legislative bodies on which a party vote had been taken at some stage in their passage.

In commenting on Professor Lowell's paper, Professor Judson spoke chiefly of party voting in state legislatures, pointing out the fact that questions that have a bearing on national party policies or organization are decided on party lines, as are problems that involve new and important policies for the state and imply higher taxation or increased responsibility. But the great mass of state legislation is altogether indifferent in character and there is no reason for expecting that on ordinary questions party proclivities or prejudices will be manifested.

Professor E. R. A. Seligman, the President-elect of the Economic Association, spoke upon the Economic Interpretation of History and sought to give a practical estimate of the so-called "materialistic conception of history." Attention was directed primarily to the five criticisms usually met with: 1st, that the theory of economic interpretation is a fatalistic doctrine; 2nd, that it rests on the assumption of historical laws, the very existence of which is open to question; 3rd, that it is socialistic; 4th, that it neglects the ethical and spiritual phases of history; 5th, that it leads to absurd exaggerations. While these objections were shown to be in a large measure destitute of foundation, it was pointed out that from the

purely philosophical standpoint the theory, especially in its extreme form, is no longer tenable as the universal explanation of all human life; but in the more restricted sense, economic interpretation—in the sense, namely, that the economic factor has been of the utmost importance in history and that the historical factor must be reckoned with in economics—the theory has been and still is of considerable significance. The subject of Professor Seligman's paper was discussed briefly by Professor Isaac A. Loos of the University of Iowa, and Professor E. P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania. Professor Cheyney objected to the practice of beginning the examination of historical facts with the preconceived notion that the leading causes and influences are economic in their nature, or, indeed, with any theory of interpretation. He contended that the simple but arduous task of the historian was to collect facts, view them objectively and arrange them as the facts themselves demanded, without reference to any especial operating force beyond that clearly shown by actual conditions. He thought that many students had been led astray because they approached the past with predetermined principles of classification and organization.

The session on Tuesday morning in which papers on southern history were read was held in the assembly room of the National Museum. The first paper, by President Lyon G. Tyler, of William and Mary College, recounted the history of the records of the London Company. Professor John S. Basset, of Trinity College, North Carolina, gave an interesting description of the relations between the Virginia planter and the London merchants. The Virginia Company attempted unsuccessfully to restrict the trade of Virginia to itself. The fall of the company, in 1624, left the trade entirely open to the world. Then appeared the direct trade between the planter and the London merchant. This system produced some serious evils. It prevented the establishment of strong trading centers in Virginia; it thus gave the colony over to a rural life; it brought about irritating disputes between the planter and the merchant; it fostered the existing system of transportation which was unsatisfactory and expensive; it had a tendency to breed antagonism to foreign capital. Many Virginians realized the need of towns, but neither the large planters nor the merchants would support the laws made to encourage towns.

The Place of Nathaniel Macon in Southern History was the title of a paper by Professor William E. Dodd, of Randolph-Macon College. After giving a brief outline of Macon's life, the speaker selected for emphasis the most significant of his political tenets and the influence of the doctrines which he tenaciously held and boldly

advocated. Macon was consistently and without variation a supporter of state rights, and is justly entitled to a place beside the members of the Southern triumvirate, Jefferson, Calhoun and Randolph. Opposed to Federalism in all its forms, standing firmly against everything sought for by the commercialists of the north, he was the typical Southern agrarian, and yet, like other agriculturalists and supporters of local rights, an advocate of territorial expansion. Even before Randolph announced his notion of the interdependence of state rights and slavery, Macon had proclaimed a like doctrine and had gone so far as to anticipate Calhoun's dogma concerning the necessity of perpetual balance between the sections.

Dr. Bernard C. Steiner, of Johns Hopkins University, spoke on the Early Courts of Maryland, closing his paper with the year 1657. The period was selected because it covered the published volumes of the provincial court records; because in it were laid the foundations of the jurisprudence of the province; and because within it occurred the numerous tumults and oppositions to the authority of the Lord Proprietor. Attention was called to the wide judicial powers conferred upon the proprietor by the provincial charter, and to the organization of the courts both by ordinance of the proprietary and by act of the general assembly. The governor was supreme judge and sat in provincial court with his councillors; at times judicial functions were exercised by the general assembly especially when there was no law to cover the case; manorial courts were provided for by the charter and some of them were actually organized. The paper closed with a brief summary of the procedure of the courts and of the kinds of cases that were chiefly found in the records.

Professor George P. Garrison, of the University of Texas, gave the last paper of the meeting, an interesting description of the work that was being done by men of the southwest in studying and writing the history of that section of the country. By the southwest was meant the old Spanish territory south and west of the line of 1819. After speaking of the courses that were given in other schools and universities he discussed at greater length the work and ambitions of his own university and the Texas Historical Association, showing how much was being accomplished in the way of adding to our scant knowledge of the early history of that region. Of chief interest to historical students were his remarks concerning the abundance of manuscript material of the greatest value to the investigator, such material as that contained in the Bexar archives, which were described by Mr. Lester G. Bugbee in a small pamphlet issued in 1899. In that collection alone there are

some 350,000 pages. The Austin papers, which have just been transferred to the custody of the university, are of great value. They are "the most important repository of documents relating to the Anglo-American colonization of Texas". Unlimited opportunity for profitable research is offered by the collections, which fortunately are now placed where they can be wisely used and industriously exploited.

At the close of this session, as we have said, the persons that were specially interested in southern history met informally to consider the subject and especially the teaching of history in the south. The formation of a separate association was thought to be inadvisable; but the conference determined to make a beginning in the examination of southern conditions by investigating the methods of teaching history in the schools. Professor Frederick W. Moore, of Vanderbilt University, was chosen chairman of the committee that will undertake this investigation.

The business meeting of the Association, which was held Monday afternoon, was well attended. The session was appropriately begun by papers devoted to the life and work of two men who had held positions of honor and usefulness in the Association, and who by their interested labor had done much to promote its prosperity. Professor George L. Burr, who is intending to write a life of Professor Moses Coit Tyler, gave a short sketch of Professor Tyler's career, speaking of the charming personality and lovable traits which endeared him to so many, and paying the tribute of a friend and admirer to literary works which were the result of painstaking and laborious research, were constructed with scrupulous accuracy and regard for truth, and were written withal in a singularly felicitous and brilliant style. The chief events in the life of Herbert B. Adams were told in a paper by Professor John M. Vincent, of Johns Hopkins University. It recounted the early school and college days of Mr. Adams, his years of study in Europe, his success in founding and carrying forward the historical work at Johns Hopkins; it spoke of the enthusiasm which he imparted to the young men who came under his instruction, his skill and vigor as a teacher, his unremitting toil in the interests of the Historical Association, and his own contributions to scholarship. The speaker fittingly called to mind the personal qualities of one who did much for the promotion of the best historical work and the sustaining of high scholarly ideals in America.

The reports of the Council and of the Treasurer showed that the affairs of the society were in good condition. The Treasurer reported that he had received, during the year 1867, annual member-

ship dues and three life memberships. Disbursements amounted to \$4,805.65 ; but in spite of the large expenditure occasioned by the many activities in which the Association is interested, the funds of the Association increased to the sum of \$14,377.65, an increase during the year of \$1,072.93. The Treasurer also reported that Professor Herbert B. Adams had bequeathed to the Association the sum of \$5,000. This money had not as yet been turned over by the executors of the estate, and it therefore did not appear in the Treasurer's report. At the Detroit meeting in 1900 the Council reported favorably on the project of appointing a committee to arrange for the publication of a co-operative history of the United States. The Association was at that time unwilling to approve of the plan without further consideration, and finally referred the matter back in order that it might be brought up at the Washington meeting. The Council now reported that it had reached the conclusion "that in view of the difficulties involved, it would not be expedient for the American Historical Association to take part in forming or carrying out a plan for the composition or publication of a co-operative history of the United States." Resolutions were offered and passed in appreciation of the wisdom of Congress in its liberal maintenance of the Congressional library. A memorial to Congress was also adopted approving the establishment of a national hall of records. It may well be added that the Council has not only provided for carrying on the established work of the Association, but has taken various new problems under consideration. A project for the establishment of a school of American historical studies at Washington, which was laid before the Council at its November meeting, and the suggestion of an American historical school at Rome, were referred to a committee of the Council.

Invitations having been received from the University of Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Historical Society and the American Philosophical Society, it was decided to hold the next meeting in Philadelphia, during the Christmas holidays, the exact date to be announced in the future. The Council appointed a committee on programme and also a local committee of arrangements. The membership of these committees appear in the list of officers and committees given below. It was also announced that Professor Harry Pratt Judson had been appointed for another term as a member of the board of editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*.

Professor William MacDonald, chairman of the Public Archives Commission, made a short report on the work of the commission to the effect that there would soon be ready for publication a somewhat

detailed account of the records of Philadelphia and less detailed descriptions of the archives of some of the states. The work of the manuscript commission was reported by Professor E. G. Bourne who said that the commission had examined the papers of Salmon P. Chase and expected to have them ready for publication in a short time. Professor George B. Adams, on behalf of the Editors of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, spoke briefly of the work and prospects of this journal, and called the attention of the Association to the fact that an increase in membership would be helpful in building up the work of the *REVIEW* and likewise of benefit to the Association, if the members secured were interested in history and in the promotion of historical studies. The committee on the Justin Winsor prize, through its chairman, Professor Charles M. Andrews, reported that seven essays had been presented, all of high excellence, and that the prize had been awarded to Ulrich B. Phillips for a monograph on the subject, "Georgia and State Rights," and that honorable mention had been made of a monograph by Miss M. Louise Greene on, "The Struggle for Religious Liberty in Connecticut."

Captain Alfred T. Mahan, the second vice-president, was elected president, Mr. Henry Charles Lea, of Philadelphia, first vice-president, and Mr. Goldwin Smith, of Toronto, second vice-president. Mr. A. Howard Clark, Professor Charles H. Haskins and Mr. Clarence W. Bowen were re-elected to positions they had held during the preceding year. Professor Frederick J. Turner and Mr. Herbert Putnam were elected to the Council.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

<i>President,</i>	Captain Alfred T. Mahan, U. S. N.
<i>First Vice-President,</i>	Henry Charles Lea, Esq.
<i>Second Vice-President,</i>	Goldwin Smith, Esq.
<i>Secretary and Curator,</i>	A. Howard Clark, Esq.
<i>Corresponding Secretary,</i>	Professor Charles H. Haskins.
<i>Treasurer,</i>	Clarence W. Bowen, Esq.
<i>Secretary of the Church History Section,</i>	Professor Samuel M. Jackson.

Executive Council (in addition to the above named officers):

Hon. Andrew D. White, ¹	Edward Eggleston, Esq., ¹
Charles Kendall Adams, Esq., ¹	Charles Francis Adams, Esq., ¹
President James B. Angell, ¹	Professor William A. Dunning, ²

¹ Ex-presidents.

² Elected members.

Henry Adams, Esq., ¹	Peter White, Esq., ²
Hon. George F. Hoar, ¹	Professor J. Franklin Jameson, ²
James Schouler, Esq., ¹	Professor A. Lawrence Lowell, ²
Professor George P. Fisher, ¹	Herbert Putnam, Esq., ²
James Ford Rhodes, Esq., ¹	Professor Frederick J. Turner. ²

Committees:

Finance Committee: Elbridge T. Gerry, Esq., chairman, George S. Bowdoin, Esq.

Committee on Programme for the Next Meeting: Professor John B. McMaster, chairman, Professors Dana C. Munro, Charles H. Haskins, Samuel M. Jackson and Frederick J. Turner.

Local Committee of Arrangements: President C. C. Harrison, chairman, Messrs. S. W. Pennypacker, J. S. Rosengarten, Talcott Williams and Henry Willis (with authority to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

Committee on the Entertainment of Ladies at the Meeting of the Association: Mrs. J. B. McMaster, chairman, Miss Ida M. Tarbell, Mrs. George O. Robinson (with authority to add auxiliary members at the discretion of the chairman).

Delegates to the International Congress of Historical Studies at Rome, April, 1902: Herbert Putnam, Esq., Professors Henry E. Bourne, Dana C. Munro, Charles H. Haskins and Ernest C. Richardson, Esq.

Editors of The American Historical Review: Professors William M. Sloane, Albert Bushnell Hart, Andrew C. McLaughlin, H. Morse Stephens, George B. Adams and Harry Pratt Judson.

Committee on Bibliography: Ernest C. Richardson, Esq., chairman, Messrs. William E. Foster, A. P. C. Griffin, George Iles, William C. Lane, J. N. Larned and Professor Charles Gross.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Professor Edward G. Bourne, chairman, Professor Frederick W. Moore, Professor Theodore C. Smith, Reuben G. Thwaites, Esq., and Professor George P. Garrison.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Professor Charles M. Andrews, chairman, Professors Edward P. Cheyney, Charles H. Hull, Williston Walker and Roger Foster, Esq.

¹ Ex-presidents.

² Elected members.

Public Archives Commission: Professor William MacDonald, chairman, Professors Herbert L. Osgood, John M. Vincent, Charles M. Andrews and Edwin E. Sparks (with power to add auxiliary members and to fill vacancies till the next meeting of the council).

Committee on Publications: Professor George L. Burr, chairman, A. Howard Clark, Esq., Professor Fred M. Fling, Professor Samuel M. Jackson, Professor Anson D. Morse, Miss Elizabeth Kendall and Professor George W. Knight.

General Committee: The corresponding secretary, chairman, Miss Lucy M. Salmon, Professors George E. Howard, John S. Bassett, William MacDonald, James H. Robinson, George B. Adams and Henry E. Bourne (with power to add auxiliary members).